

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

December 1, 1956

E-3942

Letter No. 396

Does America Want Peace—Or War?

We congratulate President Eisenhower on his strong stand against involvement of the United States in the Middle East crisis. It took courage to risk offending certain formidable elements in our country just before election.

Over the years Americans have given billions to Britain, to France and to Israel. When those countries got ready they made concerted attack on Egypt, without letting us know. They acted independently of the United States.

Information from various sections tells us the President's strong stand cost him a considerable number of votes; but it probably won him more votes from independent minded Americans.

ONE of the best News Letters is Kenneth de Courcy's *Intelligence Digest* published monthly and with a world circulation. But we are surprised at certain paragraphs in the *Digest* for November wherein the Middle East situation is discussed. Writing under the heading of "Jewish Influence in the Middle East" the editor reaches the conclusion that—

"The Western Powers are about to be forced into a total alliance with Israel."

Several years ago I met in Europe an American diplomat who had served a considerable period in the Middle East. His comment on Israel was—

"Israel is not a nation. It is a contraption held together by money collected by New York Zionists."

Most informed people would agree. It is not incompatible with the thinking of the American Council for Judaism, whose executive officer is the very able Dr. Elmer Berger. The idea that the Western Powers, which from the context of Mr. de Courcy's position clearly include the United States and Great Britain, must now make "a total alliance with Israel" is a good deal like asserting that these great Powers must now make a total alliance with any other small country, say Guate-

mala, which has a much larger population than Israel.

THE State of Israel came into being through the night-long efforts of President Truman in late November, 1947, when he threatened, or bribed a large number of small countries, each hoping for hand-outs from the United States, to reverse their previous vote which had opposed the partitioning of Palestine. Now all-out pressure is being exerted by the same Zionist element to bring the UN votes of those countries and all-out military support, if necessary, to defend Israel.

Soviet Russia is clearly flirting with some of the Arab countries. She or her satellites have sent them large quantities of munitions. But all of this situation is of our own making—that is to say, the making of the American Government and particularly of Mr. Truman. Without support from the United States, it would have been difficult if not impossible for an "Israel" to have come into existence. If we are driven into a war, which Soviet Russia intends would become World War III, we can lay it largely on the doorstep of the Roosevelt-Truman Administrations.

The Eisenhower Administration has continued the same policy as its two predecessors with respect to this little country. Both Republican and Democratic platforms of last August embodied complete commitments to maintain Israel. This could not have been engineered unless both candidates for the Presidency had agreed. Candidates and platforms alike were dominated by the highly organized Zionists.*

But the candidates are not alone responsible for

* Current Zionism is the political tenet that Jews have a right to a homeland in Palestine. The movement was given impetus by the 1917 Balfour Declaration which stipulated "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. . . ." This qualification was disregarded as Zionists drove the Arabs out of Palestine at the termination of the British Mandate in 1948. Many prominent Zionists are non-Jews.

the commitment to support Israel. A large measure of responsibility belongs on the doorsteps of some professional politicians, on some businessmen eager for trade and unwilling to raise their voices lest they offend Zionist extremists, and on left-wing writers and publishers. All of them have long been subject to furtive and galling pressure from the Zionists. The result has been to commit the United States into backing Israel, the advance post of Zionist world power, even if this course leads to the destruction of America and of American liberty.

THROUGHOUT history there have been repeated instances where certain Zionist Jews, once they have got the upper hand in any country, have overplayed that hand—to their own embarrassment, if not worse. That appears to be precisely what the Zionists have succeeded in doing in the present situation. Apparently their overreaching angered President Eisenhower and drove him to his strong stand just before election.

We are not criticizing the people of Jewish faith—in America people may practice any faith they choose. But we are taking issue with those persons, both Jews and non-Jews, who call themselves Zionists and who have undertaken to champion the synthetic State of Israel and to make its every cause their own, whether or not it is in the interest of the country of which they are citizens.

These are the folk that revel in the smear word “anti-Semitic,” who will not tolerate even such distinguished Jews as Rabbi Berger, Alfred Lilienthal, and others of like calibre, as well as thousands of others associated with the American Council for Judaism, who are Americans first and who consider Israel as foreign as France or Mexico. They do not countenance objective reporting on Middle East affairs, such as is found in Commander Hutchison’s “*Violent Truce*” or in Millar Burrows’ “*Palestine is Our Business*.”

In his autobiography, *All in a Lifetime*, the late Henry Morgenthau, Sr., lawyer, business executive and diplomat, said:

“Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history. I assert that it is wrong in principle and impossible of realization; that it is unsound in its economics, fantastical in its politics, and sterile in its spiritual ideals. . . . I speak as a Jew. . . .”

If the United States should enter into a “total alliance with Israel,” as the *Intelligence Digest* predicts, such a commitment could scarcely fail to

take the United States into the war that would surely develop between the United States on the one hand, and Soviet Russia and Red China on the other.

If the communists should win that war everything would be lost for the United States. If our side won, the Zionists would unquestionably dominate the victorious side. The American people would have lost their liberty in either event.

IN late 1953 I visited most of the Arab states of the Middle East—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. My purpose was to learn the truth about what had been going on and about the seriousness of the danger to our own peace and freedom. I wanted to see for myself, if possible, the degree of injustice inflicted upon the Arabs by the partitioning of Palestine and the extent of their suffering.

It is well known that more than 800,000 Arabs were driven by the Israeli out of the homes in Palestine where they had lived alongside Jews in complete friendliness for more than a thousand years. The Jews who drove them out were not the long-time residents—they were immigrants sent in from various countries by World Zionism. What I saw was how the United Nations was administering its “relief” at a cost of nine cents per day per head—to the refugees who had been unable to find work. I visited various refugee camps where I saw great misery and squalor. Apparently little more had been done for the Arab refugees by the United Nations or by the United States or by any other country, aside from this meager allowance which had been just about enough to keep them alive. The wound, physical and mental, had been allowed to fester.

Meanwhile five years had then elapsed (eight years now). For eight years the situation has constituted a veritable invitation to Soviet Russia to come in and stir up trouble. And this is just what they are now doing.

For centuries in many of the Middle Eastern countries there has been much poverty. The discovery and development of oil in Iraq and Saudi Arabia has produced great wealth, only some of which has filtered down to the poorer people.

The Government of the United States has done little to benefit the Arab countries. But the State of Israel has been supported by substantial grants from the United States Government. Dan Smoot of Dallas, Texas, in his *Report* of November 19,

1956, says that as of June 30, 1955 the United States Government has given \$359 million to Israel. *Time Magazine* of November 19 (p. 27), says that charitable collections in the United States by Jewish organizations for Israel have reached the impressive total of \$700 million, and that in addition the Zionist "bond drives" have netted \$275 million more. Most of this has come from American Jews, many of them unwilling givers; and many non-Jews have been "persuaded" to give, also. In addition to this Israel has been receiving about \$70 million a year in goods the past five or six years from West Germany; this scheme having been foisted upon West Germany as a kind of "indemnity" for Hitler atrocities against Jews, though not over about 15 per cent of all Jews in Israel came from Germany. Besides this the government of Israel is now undertaking to borrow \$75 million from the International Bank in Washington.

After talking with many Arabs, I began asking a single question of every Arab I met: "If you could frame the policy of the United States toward Israel, what would that policy be?"

In every instance the reply was that the United States should stop all financial and other material aid to Israel. The problem, they said, would then work itself out.

LATELY I have been in touch with certain powerful Arab leaders, and have put to them the same question. **The answer has been the same: let the American Government stop interfering in the Middle East—by subsidizing our enemy.**

The greatest threat of World War III today is the continued financing of Israel by the United States, or by its Zionist-sympathizing citizens with the tacit approval of the American Government. Money and goods in the hundreds of millions are going out of the United States to Israel. The chief result—if not the chief object—of all this is the setting up of a beach-head for the ultimate triumph of World Zionism.

Already, though we hope only temporarily, the flow of oil from the Middle East to America and Europe has been cut off. A general war there, with Soviet Russia lined up with the Arabs, would cost America the loss of huge investments in oil, in addition to the fabulous loss of life and the general bankruptcy that would follow World War III.

Is it worth while, in view of all this, for the

American people to permit their Government to continue, through aid to Israel, to subsidize disaster?

SO the American people are confronted with the simple question—do they want peace or war, a Zionist war in which American sons and husbands would die like sheep—for Israel?

Granting that the Zionists are powerful in this country, with the backing of many of the ten to twelve million Jews in the United States, are the American people willing to allow this Zionist minority to force upon them a war which even if they win they will lose?

On Friday, November 16, I listened to the address of the chairman of the Iraqi Delegation to the United Nations, former Prime Minister Fadhel Jamali. Dr. Jamali, the holder of both a Ph. D. and also an honorary doctorate from Columbia University, made a masterly address which was received with close attention. Yet the following morning not a single New York newspaper so much as mentioned that Dr. Jamali had spoken. The *New York Herald Tribune* in its "Early Edition" had a line mentioning Dr. Jamali's name, but even the mention of his name was cut out in the "Late City Edition."

THE theory on which the United Nations was set up in 1945, and the theory on which the people of the United States were persuaded to give up \$55 billion for foreign aid, taken out of the pockets mostly of wage earners, for the benefit of other countries in the world, was that both the UN and the squandering of American wealth would promote peace.

Yet as things have worked out, and indeed as was predicted all along by a farsighted few, both of these movements have resulted in great gains by both socialism and communism in the United States and in most parts of the world. World peace seems farther off today than at any time since 1945.

With American hard-earned dollars the Labor Party in Britain was enabled pretty thoroughly to establish socialism. Money and goods given to Tito were used to further communism. Under Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower, the policy seems to have been that if we promoted the welfare of other nations, the welfare of America would look out for itself. It just hasn't worked out that way.

Due to our commitments through the UN and

otherwise to Britain and France, we were prevented from winning the Korean War. In effect we lost it ignominiously. We have been persuaded to send a million men to all parts of the world, ostensibly to preserve peace. But, if general war should come, and this may happen at any time, these troops are in such small units it would be difficult for them either to make their way home, or for us to rescue them. In this and a dozen ways we have scattered our resources, our assets, our manpower.

ISN'T it time now, no matter what the Republican or Democratic Party platforms said, about Israel, to realize that no one is going to look out for the United States except the United States? Isn't it time to stop sending hundreds of millions to build up World Zionism, when it is certain that if we do not stop, the continued existence of the State of Israel will mean war with Soviet Russia?

For Soviet Russia, in her contest with Red China for the domination of the Soviet world, has *got* to have the Middle East. She can't get the Middle East in all probability, unless the Arabs are on her side. I am satisfied we can still retain the Arabs on our side if our Government and people will only stop being dominated in their thinking and in their actions by Zionism.

If we continue to finance Israel, we will have a world war. If we withdraw our support of Israel, we can have peace.

It is not too late to decide—even now.

But it is very late.

Melvin L. Hail

President,

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

BOOK REVIEW

Here is a book loyal Americans have been waiting for—*Inside the State Department* by Bryton Barron. He was “let out” of the Department in early 1956 because he had strongly opposed deleting important parts of the “Yalta Papers” before publication in 1955. (See P. 46)

The 178 pages are easy to read. To call them revealing would be a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. Barron shows how the Department, now fifteen times larger and more costly than in 1929, is a law unto itself. It defies Congress. It drafts treaties, as well as the messages for the signature of the President in transmitting the treaties to the Senate. Says Barron (P. 141) “In many cases the President and even the Secretary were no more than dimly aware of the fact that such an agreement had been negotiated.” Says Barron further (P. 142) “I recall no case in which either the Secretary or the President objected to what was presented to them, in the larger sense, as a *fait accompli*. Almost invariably the Secretary would sign the report, and the President the message ‘on the dotted line’ and without change.”

People wonder why propaganda for the UN and UNESCO is so strong. They wonder why such a multitude of Executive Agreements have been entered into. The answers are found in this book. The “planners” in State practically thumb their noses at the Congress, and to a large extent tell the Secretary what to do — and mold much of the thinking of the President himself. They are a government within the Government.

President Eisenhower has let it be known he is going to push “his program” aggressively after the Congress meets in January. But more important than this whole program is the need for a Joint Congressional investigation of the State Department. Read Barron's book and you'll see why.

Order *Inside the State Department* from National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Bldg., New York 1, N. Y. Price \$3.00 postpaid. Add 3% for sales tax for sales in New York City.

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part, provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter 396, December 1, 1956.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., established in 1930, is a non-profit, non-partisan membership corporation organized under New York State law. It publishes the semi-monthly ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER and occasional ECONOMIC COUNCIL PAPERS.

Subscription \$10 a year, \$6 for six months, \$3.50 for three months. Special rate for student or teacher, \$5 a year.

Air Mail Subscription (domestic) \$11.44 a year, Air Mail (foreign) \$15.00 a year.

EXTRA COPIES of this Council Letter 15c each (8 for \$1), \$9 per 100, \$50 per 1,000.

Special prices will be quoted for larger quantities. Please add 3% sales tax for deliveries in Greater New York and 4% shipping charges on quantities of 100 or more.

**National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.**